



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,923	04/21/2004	Jose Castillo Deniega	IFLOW.063C3	5645

20995 7590 03/28/2008  
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
----------

MACNEILL, ELIZABETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3767

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/28/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com  
eOAPilot@kmob.com



## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1,2, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (US 5,425,723) in view of Tremulis (US 6,102,903).

Wang teaches an elongated non-porous tube having a uniform diameter with an infusion section (18) and connectable to a supply of liquid (via 30) outside of the patient and an inner member (38) with a plurality of exit holes for evenly distributing fluid before it exits the tube. Wang does not teach that the inner member is porous or becomes "saturated."

Tremulis teaches that it is known in the art that a tube with a plurality of small holes is an equivalent of a porous tube. " Usually, a plurality of infusion ports will be distributed over the catheter body in a predesignated pattern, more usually the ports will be longitudinally and circumferentially spaced from each other about the catheter body. The number of ports and the spacing between adjacent ports will, of course, depend on a variety of factors, such as the function of the delivery catheter, the type and quantity of fluid being delivered, the size of the restriction or blockage, etc. For example, the catheter may have from 1 to 100 ports, usually from 3 to 30 ports, and the ports may be formed on only one side of the catheter body to specifically direct

fluid towards one side of a fluid vessel. Alternatively, the catheter may have a multitude of tiny perforations (i.e., greater than 100) or the catheter may have a portion constructed of a porous material.” Bottom of Col 4 to top of Col 5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a porous inner tube instead of an inner tube with a plurality of holes since it has been held that simple substitution of one equivalent for another is within the skill of an ordinary worker in the art.

2. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Burns (US 5,032,113).

Wang discloses the catheter as above, but do not disclose that the porous member is not concentric with the outer tube or a ring shaped bond at the middle portion of the infusion section. Burns discloses a catheter with inner (18) and outer (12) tubes wherein the outer tube and inner tube are not concentric (Fig 11 or Fig 13). Burns further discloses a middle bond (40, Fig 4B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the tubes nonconcentric as a matter of obvious design choice.

3. Claims 4,6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Abiuso (US 5,213,576).

Wang teaches the catheter as above but does not specify the pore size or ring shaped bonds at the proximal and distal ends of the infusion section.

Abiuso teaches an infusion catheter with porous insert (40) with pores of 15-30 microns and two ring shaped bonds (31 and 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a pore size of 15-30 microns and bond the porous member to the tube in because it would be expected to evenly distribute medicament and prevent leakages from the ends of the infusion section.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Reynolds (US 5,370,610).

Wang discloses the invention as above but fail to teach an air filter in the flow path of the catheter. Reynolds discloses a catheter with an air filter in the flow path of a catheter (64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an air filter in order to prevent bacteria from entering the body.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7,9 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH R. MACNEILL whose telephone number is (571)272-9970. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Simons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elizabeth R MacNeill/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3767  
/Kevin C. Sirmons/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767